



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,028	09/17/2003	Soo-hong Park	Q76745	2599
23373	7590	02/06/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			KEEFER, MICHAEL E	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			2154	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10664028	9/17/2003	PARK, SOO-HONG	Q76745

EXAMINER

Michael E. Keefer

ART UNIT

PAPER

2154

20080201

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

1. The reply filed on 12/13/2007 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): See below for detail. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

The Examiner notes that this response to the Non-Final Office Action of 9/13/2007 is Non-responsive for the following reasons:

1) Applicant has failed to address the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hinden et al. (RFC 2373) in view of Marttinen et al. (US 6222853), but has instead addressed arguments related to a previously withdrawn rejection of Hinden in view of Lee.

2) Applicant has failed to address all grounds of rejection for claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. 101, specifically, the fact that these claims are drawn to non-functional descriptive material, as the data structure claimed causes no function to take place.

NATHAN E LYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER